



Public Participation Hearing Pilot Report

Administrative Law Judge Division
and News and Outreach Office

Authors:

- Christine Walwyn, Administrative Law Judge
- Jeanne McKinney, Assistant Chief
Administrative Law Judge
- W. Anthony Colbert, Assistant Chief
Administrative Law Judge
- Terrie Prosper, Director, News and Outreach
Office
- Allison Brown, Public Advisor, News and
Outreach Office

February 20, 2019



1. Summary

In 2018, Commissioners and Division Directors worked together to pilot a new approach to Public Participation Hearings (PPH) in energy and water General Rate Cases (GRC). This report provides a summary of the results and recommendations for next steps. This report is the work product of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Division and the News and Outreach Office (NOO).

The 37 PPHs in the pilot incorporated new features designed (a) to better educate the public about the GRC proceedings and (b) to increase meaningful public participation that the CPUC can use in its decision-making. More than 60 staff from throughout the CPUC participated in the pilot PPHs, and they are individually recognized in Appendix A of this report.

The features of the pilot PPH program were first proposed in a report by NOO and based on a survey of outreach programs of other similar agencies, undertaken per Senate Bill 512. NOO then worked with ALJ Division to refine the features for incorporation into actual PPHs. The final specifications for the pilot were set forth in an email from Commissioner Clifford Rechtschaffen to all CPUC Directors.

1.1. Recommendations and Best Practices

Best Practices Start with a Kick Off Meeting

1. The Kick Off Meeting should include NOO, assigned ALJ, assigned Commissioner office and industry division analyst.
2. The Kick Off Meeting should be held within 2 weeks of proceeding assignment so that the right outreach alternatives can be identified, the parties can comment on the proposed outreach at the PHC, and PPHs can be scheduled with enough time for customer notice.

3. Working with NOO, and in consultation with the assigned ALJ, Commissioner should engage CBOs early and use CBO assistance in scheduling community meetings, PPHs and other types of outreach.
4. NOO should create toolkit documenting alternative types of public meetings and discuss the alternatives at the Kick Off Meeting. Tools should be selected keeping in mind the needs of the specific case.

Recommendations on When and How to Communicate with Customers:

1. Schedule the PPH early in proceeding if possible.
2. ALJ Division and NOO should set up an internal CPUC working group to assess the value of PPH input in different types of proceedings and make recommendations for future.
3. Continue to have industry divisions, working with the ALJ Division and NOO, prepare Fact Sheets and consider other types of industry division products such as short video summarizing issues in the proceeding in plain language.
4. In outreach materials and at PPHs, promote new and existing tools such as Subscription Service, Online Comment Portal, links to Docket Card, Twitter feed, as available.
5. Working with NOO, the assigned ALJ should ensure that the ruling directing utility preparation covers optimal types of outreach and PPH and/or community meeting responsibilities.
6. NOO should head team to consider bill insert design improvements and enhancements.

A full list of recommendations is at the end of this report.

2. Background

2.1. What is a Public Participation Hearing (PPH)?

A PPH is a formally noticed hearing for the CPUC to hear from the public. In a GRC proceeding, it is an opportunity for the utility's customers to provide their views on the utility's filed application, to specifically comment on service quality, safety, rate increase impacts, rate design proposals, and other issues of concern, and to do so in person and directly to the presiding ALJ and, when available, the assigned Commissioner. A court reporter is present at the PPH and the reporter's transcript is part of the formal record in the proceeding. PPHs are typically scheduled in all general rate cases. In addition, PPHs are scheduled in other proceedings where it is determined that including oral public comment in the record has value.¹

The CPUC holds PPHs in communities throughout the utility's service territory in order to give the public a voice in our formal proceedings and also to inform our decision-making. Reviewing public comment assists the assigned ALJ and Commissioner, as well as parties, in identifying issues of particular concern to customers that might otherwise be overlooked. When such issues are identified, the assigned ALJ can take steps to include them in the decision-making process by ordering supplemental inquiry, investigation, testimony or briefing. Public Advocates Office and other parties may also elect to expand their inquiry to include concerns raised in PPHs.²

¹ Written public comment can be made at any time and is always part of the record. NOO makes public comments available to the assigned ALJ and Commissioners.

² Senate Bill 854 (Stats. 2018, ch. 51) amended Pub. Util. Code Section 309.5(a) so that the Office of Ratepayer Advocates Is now named the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission. We will refer to this office as the "Public Advocates Office" or "Cal Advocates."

There is no statutory requirement for the CPUC to hold PPHs and the term is not included in our Rules of Practice and Procedure. However, the Commission's decisions establishing the rate case plans for energy and water utilities specifically mention PPHs. For the General Rate Case (GRC) proceedings of energy utilities, there is a requirement in our rate case plan decision, Decision (D.) 07-07-004, Appendix A, that the ALJ set the day, time and place for public comment hearings. For water GRCs, D.07-05-062 provides that PPHs for GRC proceedings of Class A water utilities are expected but discretionary, based on the public interest.

The PPHs are considered part of each proceeding's formal record. As the term "hearing" suggests, a PPH is conducted in a formal manner. Notice is given pursuant to the Commission's Rules, an ALJ or Commissioner presides at the hearing, and a court reporter transcribes the hearing.

This formal procedure reflects the respect and importance the CPUC gives to the public's participation in the CPUC's decision-making, and strengthens the formal record if there is appellate review of an issue in a CPUC decision that cites to public comments.

2.2. Senate Bill 512 Mandate and CPUC Research Project Report

Senate Bill 512 (Stats. 2016, ch. 808) requires the Policy and Planning Division of the Commission to undertake one or more studies of outreach efforts undertaken by other state and federal utility bodies and to make recommendations to the CPUC to promote effective outreach, including metrics for use in evaluating success.

In compliance with this directive, NOO, in consultation with the Commission's Policy and Planning Division, interviewed 42 different regulatory agencies throughout the U.S. on their outreach efforts. In its April 2018 report,

“SB 512 Research Project Report,” NOO found that the CPUC was well within norms of other institutions; however, there were additional outreach methods that the CPUC could implement to improve its program. The report included suggestions for future outreach by the Commission.

Based on the findings of the SB 512 Research Project Report, NOO, in consultation with ALJ Division, made a series of recommendations that became the basis of the PPH Pilot to enhance outreach and customer education for PPHs.

2.3. April 2, 2018 Announcement of the Pilot PPH Program

Carrying forward the recommendations of NOO’s SB 512 Research Project Report, Commissioner Rechtschaffen and Commissioner Martha Guzman Aceves worked with NOO, ALJ Division, and Water and Energy Divisions to develop a pilot program to test the recommended enhancements. After meeting with Executive Director Alice Stebbins and Division Directors on March 29, 2018, Commissioner Rechtschaffen summarized the Pilot PPH Program in an email to the meeting attendees on April 2, 2018, as follows:

- The pilot program will be for Phase 1 GRCs, energy and water cases.
- The Commission will have an informal education session an hour prior to the PPHs consisting of informational tables staffed by the Commission’s NOO and various formal parties. The applicant utility will be required to attend and have a table, and the Commission will encourage Public Advocates to attend. Other parties will be invited but not required to attend. NOO will develop printed materials, helpful visuals and posters, etc. that explain basic information about the Commission and its processes, including how to make comments, how to subscribe to proceeding documents, how to file a consumer complaint, how to intervene in a case, etc.
- At the start of the PPH, a member of NOO will do a short presentation (5-10 minutes) providing an overview of the Commission and its processes, what the GRC is about, and how the public can participate in the proceeding. The NOO will refer to

other processes for the public to engage in apart from the GRC (i.e. file customer complaints, etc.).

- In addition, during the PPH, a member of the Industry Division (Water or Energy) will provide a 5-10 minute summary of the application and what it is intended to accomplish. This will be relatively straightforward and factual, and not a Q&A session.

NOO developed a video about GRCs and specific videos for each GRC PPH for social media and the CPUC's website, including Spanish scripts.

2.4. Proceedings Covered Under the Pilot PPH Program

Six utilities' major rate case proceedings were chosen for the pilot PPH program, three water utilities and three energy utilities. With the exception of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) consolidated Gas Transmission and Storage Services (GT&S) and Gas Cost Allocation Proceeding (GCAP), which authorize PG&E's natural gas transmission and storage revenue requirement and are separate GRC-like proceedings, all of these proceedings are designated as GRCs. The utilities, their proceedings, and the PPHs scheduled for each utility were:

- San Jose Water Company (SJWC), Application (A.) 18-01-004, one PPH held on May 30, 2018;
- San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), A.17-10-007, six PPHs held in three locations between June 13-28, 2018;
- Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), A.17-10-008, 12 PPHs held in six locations between May 29-June 21, 2018;
- PG&E, A.17-09-006 and A.17-11-009, 14 PPHs held in seven locations between June 26-July 17, 2018;
- Park Water Company (Park), A.18-01-003, two PPHs held in one location on October 18, 2018; and

- Apple Valley Ranchos Water Corp. (AVR), A.18-01-002, two PPHs held in one location on October 25, 2018.

A list of each PPH location and date, together with the number of attendees and speakers at each hearing is attached as Appendix B. An ALJ presided at each PPH, the NOO staffed each PPH, and Commissioners attended eight of the 37 PPHs.

2.5. Metrics for Analysis of the Pilot PPH Program

The goals set by Commissioners Guzman Aceves and Rechtschaffen are two-fold: first, to better inform the public about each proceeding and, second, to increase the public's meaningful participation in our proceedings. To better inform PPH attendees about the proceeding, the CPUC held Information Sessions prior to the start of the PPHs, distributed Fact Sheets, and Industry Division staff made presentations at the PPHs.

Increasing the public's meaningful participation is measured by evaluating the comments made by the speakers at the PPHs and also the written comments received by the NOO. The CPUC's goal is not just robust public turnout at the PPHs but rather obtaining public comments that can inform the CPUC's decision-making. These include comments that raise new issues or a new perspective on service quality, safety, environmental considerations, and unforeseen impacts of rate structures. The issues raised in public comments can then be examined within the scope of the proceeding or cause the scope of the proceeding to be expanded. For measurement purposes, a working definition of meaningful comments are comments that inform our decision-making.

A recent example of public comments informing an energy GRC Proposed Decision is in PG&E's 2017 GRC proceeding, A.15-09-001. In Section 1.4 (Public Participation Hearings and Correspondence from PG&E Ratepayers), ALJ Stephen C. Roscow wrote:

Finally, one of the more noteworthy aspects of the PPHs was the consistent attendance of local government officials at every location, all of whom expressed strong concern about proposals in this proceeding relating to PG&E's Commission-mandated program to "underground" what are currently overhead utility lines in communities throughout PG&E's service territory. Many of these officials also noted their concern regarding the Commission's treatment of the same undergrounding issue in PG&E's 2011 and 2014 GRCs. In response to the concerns expressed by these officials, approximately half the hearing time devoted to examination of the Settlement Agreement was devoted to this issue, and we have modified this area of the Settlement Agreement.³

While obtaining meaningful comments should be a primary metric for assessing the success of PPHs, NOO will continue to track the number of attendees and speakers at each PPH, as well as the number of written comments submitted. When the new online proceeding specific comment system is operational, these comments will also be tracked. In addition, NOO will continue to seek customers' evaluations at the PPHs through a survey.

2.6. Quantitative Metrics

The quantitative metrics available for the pilot PPHs are the number of PPHs for each proceeding and the number of attendees and speakers at each PPH. This information is summarized in a table attached as Appendix B. As shown, there were many more PPHs held in each of the energy proceedings as their service territories are geographically much larger and hence there are more PPH locations. However, the number of attendees and speakers at each of the electric GRC Phase 1 PPHs was lower than the at water GRC PPHs.

³ Proposed Decision issued on February 27, 2017, at 19. The final CPUC decision, D.17-05-013, issued on May 11, 2017, retained this discussion section but did not adopt the underlying adjustment from the Proposed Decision. See pp 2-3 of the Proposed Decision and pp. 2-3 of the final Decision.

2.7. Qualitative Metrics

The qualitative metrics available for the pilot PPHs are: 1.) the comments of public speakers about our PPH process; 2.) the surveys submitted by customers at the PPHs; and 3.) the questionnaires completed by staff participating in the pilot program. The staff questionnaire was sent to all participants in the Commissioner offices, NOO, Energy Division, Water Divisions, and the Public Advocates Office as well as the participating utilities and interested parties. The questionnaire consisted of four questions:

1. What parts of the Pilot program do you think worked well and why?
2. What parts of the Pilot program did not work well and why?
3. What refinements/changes would you recommend and why?
4. Do you have any suggestions on ways to increase attendance at PPHs?

This short questionnaire was designed to elicit a high response rate and broad range of suggestions. A longer form questionnaire was sent to the participating ALJs and additional comments received from the management of Energy Division and Public Advocates. Overall, 35 responses were submitted and are summarized in Appendix C. NOO also distributed a separate customer questionnaire at the PPHs, and the eight responses submitted are summarized in Appendix D

Our review of the pilot PPH transcripts and questionnaires, combined with public comments, as well as attendance figures for each PPH, raise issues to be discussed in the remaining sections of this report.

3. Discussion and Analysis of Pilot PPH Program

3.1. Attendance

Attendance at the energy GRC PPHs ranged from no public attendees to 34 attendees, with the median number being 13. Public speakers at the PPHs ranged from zero to 22, with the median number being two. The low turnout was not unusual for energy GRC PPHs. One ALJ wrote that he has handled three Phase 1 GRCs and one Phase 2 GRC and he believed that the public turnout for these PPHs has always been quite low. However, another ALJ who has handled multiple electric rate design PPHs, including Phase 2 GRCs, found that customers were interested and provided useful comments at PPHs addressing rate design.

The reasons cited in questionnaires for low turnout are:

- customers stated they did not receive any notice of the hearing (they attended, nonetheless, so it is surmised that they would have preferred another form of contact);
- bill inserts are a major way of notifying the public of a PPH and many customers do not read the inserts;
- hearing notice for electronically billed customers is hard for the customer to find;
- need to use plain language in the bill inserts and better entice customers to attend by telling them what the proceeding means to them;
- the public may not be interested in the proceeding;
- the public may be aware of the PPH but might not be interested in attending;
- the public does not feel they are being heard;
- formal hearings intimidate people; and

- “voices in the community” (churches, community groups, local officials) should deliver the notice of the PPH.

Based on this feedback we recommend that there be a specific focus on providing information in a manner that would make customers want to take the time to attend a PPH. For example, customers may be more engaged if provided with bill impact figures, easy to understand language, links to more information such as fact sheets. Customers may also become more engaged if they are made aware that utility representatives will be present at the PPHs and can help with billing issues, provide sign-ups for low-income or conservation programs and address other customer service issues. In addition, customers should be informed that a CPUC Consumer Affairs Branch (CAB) representative will be present at the PPH to take customer complaints.

3.2. Customer Notice for Energy PPHs

At SDG&E’s El Cajon and Chula Vista hearings, customers complained they did not realize the CPUC was holding a hearing in their community until the day of the hearing when they heard it on TV. At PG&E’s Oakland PPH, several local pastors said they were only aware of the PPH a few days before when they were contacted by The Utility Reform Network (TURN); these pastors then reached out to congregants. This resulted in higher attendance than the pilot program’s average attendance and participation. In Oakland there were 37 attendees and 25 speakers, in Chula Vista 53 attendees and 28 speakers, and in El Cajon 25 attendees and 8 speakers.

The PPH notice process begins at the kick-off meeting where NOO, the assigned ALJ, and the Commissioner’s office, identify the date, time, and location of each PPH. Once finalized, this list will be included or referenced in the Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Memo. Because no notices should be issued prior to confirmation of the location and date, finalizing the list can be a time-

consuming and iterative process taking several weeks. The ALJ then puts out a ruling instructing the utility on outreach and PPH requirements. (See Section 3.5, ALJ Role.) The dates and locations are then added to formal hearing section of the CPUC's Daily Calendar.

Following this, a bill insert is drafted by the utility and reviewed and approved by NOO. The bill insert summarizes the requests contained in the utility's application and gives customers additional information about the PPH and the NOO. The approved bill insert is then included by the utility in every customer's bill, either by mail or electronically, or if the utility uses bi-monthly billing, the notice is sometimes separately mailed. Concurrently, additional media and stakeholder outreach is done by NOO.

The CPUC needs to improve billing inserts and consider other ways of noticing customers. Regarding bill inserts, there is a risk that even when the bill insert is timely received the customer may not recognize its importance and may discard it without learning the date of the PPH. One commenter suggested that if the bill insert fails to capture a ratepayer's attention then attendance will be low. The current bill inserts have dense text in tiny print and the technical language, written to comply with legal requirements, is difficult to read. A copy of SDG&E's bill insert is attached as Appendix E.

Another commenter stated that electronic bill notices do not always include PPH information in a way that is readily accessed. This commenter proposed that utilities use direct emails to consumers with the PPH notice already opened, not a link to a website where the notice is held.

NOO is responsible for reviewing bill inserts. NOO should lead a cross-divisional team in assessing customer bill inserts for GRCs and determining improvements that should be made. NOO will also consult with external entities, such as TURN and community groups.

3.3. Differences between Energy and Water PPHs

Despite public participation at water GRC PPHs being higher than the energy GRC PPHs, concern still exists with customers as to whether the CPUC hears their comments and whether their comments are effective in influencing the CPUC's decision-making. Several speakers at Park Water's PPH voiced concern that they had no choice in who their utility was and the CPUC has not been effective in keeping their water rates in line with adjoining water utilities, or even in line with the rates of the other Class A water utilities the CPUC regulates. Realtors at both Park and AVR PPHs said some of their clients chose not to purchase homes in Park's and AVR's service territories due to water bills being twice as high as those in neighboring areas. One customer requested the CPUC notify the customers directly of our final Decision on the proceeding.

Echoing the public comment, the CPUC received, a recommendation in the questionnaires is that, in addition to advising customers on how to be a formal party or sign up for the CPUC's subscription service, the CPUC should provide information at the PPH about how to use the Subscription Service to sign-up to receive a copy of the final Decision. This recommendation should be implemented as it allows customers to read the final Decision and evaluate how public comments were considered in the CPUC's decision-making.

3.4. When and Where Should a PPH be Scheduled

Most comments from CPUC staff favored holding PPHs early in the proceeding. Given that it takes at least two months of lead time to work with the community in finding the best dates, time and location, planning must begin almost immediately after an application is filed. The reasons for having the PPH held early in the procedural schedule are two-fold. First, by hearing the public's views early in the proceeding, the ALJ and assigned Commissioner can, more

easily, modify and/or adjust the scope of issues to be addressed in the proceeding. The Public Advocates Office can incorporate information it receives at the PPH in its testimony, and the ALJ can request additional utility testimony and/or exhibits for the Evidentiary Hearings. Second, holding the PPH early in the procedural schedule allows the CPUC to inform the community early on the ways they can follow the proceeding and continue to effectively participate.

The main disadvantage to holding the PPH early is that the public may not have enough information to want to participate. A PPH held after all party testimony is served would allow the public to better understand the issues. This may make it easier for people to provide their views on all the parties' proposals or the proposed outcome.

Public Advocates Office points out that the worst time to hold a PPH is in the middle of the proceeding since its staff resources are already committed, especially if supplemental testimony is ordered based on public information received at the PPH.

The issue of where to hold a PPH generated suggestions from the public, staff, and outside parties. A poor venue choice could result in poor attendance. Staff working on the PPH pilot suggest that state and municipal buildings might be seen as unwelcoming, particularly in the evening when government building areas are largely empty. For example, a Sacramento PPH was held at the California Energy Commission where the building and surrounding area were uninhabited in the evening and not well lighted. The San Francisco PPH was held in the CPUC's Auditorium on a night when the entrance was blocked by construction activities. Libraries, community or senior centers, and areas close to residential housing might be considered more welcoming. Ideal locations should have good parking, lack of physical barriers, and nearby public transit. ALJ

Division and NOO already consider these factors when choosing venues and they should continue to do so.

Another suggestion to aid the public wishing to attend a PPH is to include directions and a map in the notice.

Working with community leaders and local CBOs in selecting dates and locations would be an important step in making the CPUC's PPH locations more public friendly and also increasing the public's awareness and interest.

Several questionnaires generally suggest that the CPUC consider partnering with local government or a CBO on a joint event. Few specifics were given other than having NOO staff inquire about other community events at the time of the PPH. TURN specifically suggested holding "bill fairs" with social service agencies and CBOs serving low income residents. Another suggestion is that the CPUC explore ways to reach a younger group of the public, both students and millennials, who are not well represented at current PPHs and could bring different perspectives to our decision-making.

ALJ Division recommends that the assigned Commissioner and ALJ in an energy or water GRC proceeding give strong consideration to holding PPHs early in the procedural schedule and to working closely with NOO in scheduling dates, times, and locations that are recommended by elected, local community leaders and/or CBOs, as feasible.

3.5. ALJ Role

An important role for the assigned ALJ is to issue an ALJ Ruling noticing the PPHs. In this ruling, the ALJ:

1. sets the date, time, and location of each PPH,
2. directs the utility to prepare a bill notice informing its customers of the PPH and to submit a draft of the notice to NOO by a date certain,

3. directs the utility to mail the notice approved by NOO in the customer's monthly bill, or, to the extent any customer is billed electronically, provide notice to those customers electronically,
4. directs the utility to publish the approved notice by a date certain in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the utility's service territory where the PPHs will be held and to post the notice in all of the utility's offices where customers come in contact with its customer service representatives,
5. directs the utility to provide the NOO and the assigned ALJ, not later than 5 days prior to the first PPH, a letter verifying that the utility has complied with the customer notice requirement and stating the date(s) notice was sent to customers and the approximate number of customers so notified. The compliance letter should also provide the dates and locations of publication and posting,
6. directs the utility to provide a customer service representative at each of the PPHs to answer any billing or service questions that individual customers may have and for the utility to also provide at each of the PPHs employees knowledgeable about the application, and
7. provides additional directives to parties regarding the PPH as appropriate.

Importantly, in order to time bill inserts with existing customer billing schedules, locations must be confirmed 60 – 90 days in advance. The bill insert cannot be finalized until the location is confirmed. NOO must then approve the bill insert. Then the utility will have it printed. Because billing cycles are at least 30 days, the final printed inserts must be ready at least a month in advance. As discussed earlier, customers at Apple Valley's PPH complained that they received the customer notice only two to three days prior to the PPH. We agree that attendance may be improved if bill inserts are received more than three days in advance. To avoid this happening in the future, NOO, the assigned ALJ, and the assigned Commissioner must hold the kick-off meeting soon after the application is filed, and quickly come up with a proposed schedule.

Another PPH notice issue the ALJ can address at a Prehearing Conference (PHC) with all parties, or in the ALJ Ruling noticing the PPHs, is whether to direct the utility to take additional steps to inform its customers of the PPHs, such as requiring the applicant utility to issue a media advisory, conduct social media for the PPHs, and place information on the PPHs on its homepage.

In its 2018 GRC proceeding, A.16-09-001, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) took the initiative to inform its customers by:

- Providing the company's visually impaired customers with a Braille copy or a large font version of the notice.
- Posting information on SCE.com, and presenting the date, time, and location of each of the six PPHs.
- Using social media by posting notice on SCE's Facebook page.
- Sending notice and contacting the City Managers, City Clerks, and City Councilmembers of the cities where the PPHs are scheduled, as well as other nearby cities.
- Sending notice and requesting that SCE's authorized payment agents post notice of the PPHs.
- Sending notice to city halls, libraries, recreation centers, and senior citizen centers and requesting posting of the notice.⁴

3.6. ALJ/NOO Presentation from Pilot Program

The pilot program initially envisioned a short presentation (5-10 minutes) by NOO after the ALJ's and Commissioner's opening comments. This presentation would provide an overview of the CPUC and its processes and explain the GRC process. The presentation would tell the public how they can

⁴ See April 28, 2017 Proof of Compliance with Rule 13.1 in A.16-09-001.

participate in the proceeding, including other processes for public engagement, such as sending written comments or filing a complaint.

In implementing this provision, the NOO found the ALJ was already addressing these topics as part of opening comments and, therefore this presentation was not necessary.

We recommend that once the Docket Card projects are completed, the ALJ should include mention of these new tools in the opening comments.

3.7. Industry Division Fact Sheets

The pilot program innovation that received the most favorable comments was the Energy and Water Industry Divisions' Fact Sheets. These sheets are two sided with colored graphics and were distributed to all PPH attendees. The Water Division prepared the first Fact Sheet for the SJWC PPH and Energy Division used a similar format for its Fact Sheets.

Briefly, the Fact Sheet:

- summarizes the utility's total requested rate increase in dollars and percentages, and then gives the rate impact for an average residential customer,
- lists the top four to seven factors for the requested rate relief, citing specific projects,
- -provides a colored pie chart of the cost components of the utility's total revenue,
- attaches a rate table(s) under existing and proposed rates for each customer class, and
- includes weblink cites to the utility's and Public Advocates Office testimony.

In addition, the Fact Sheets for PG&E's proceedings included geographically specific average residential usage for each PPH.

An objective of the pilot PPH was information sharing, that is, to provide the public a summary of the key components of each utility's rate request in understandable language and format. While many questionnaire respondents and customers praised the use and success of the Fact Sheets, many also stated that the content was too technical. A copy of Liberty Utilities' Park Water Corporation's Fact Sheet from the pilot program is attached as Appendix F. A simplified Fact Sheet from the current PPH of California Water Service Company's Willow District is attached as Appendix G.

We recommend that the CPUC retain the use of the Fact Sheets for upcoming energy and water GRC PPHs while also having the industry Division analyst/engineer who is preparing the Fact Sheet work with NOO so that language and format in the Fact Sheet more clearly communicates the information to the public. The final Fact Sheet developed should always be approved by the Industry Division to ensure the material remains factually accurate.

The Fact Sheets can also be effectively used in the communities and with the local media prior to the PPH in order to increase public awareness of the proceeding. The Fact Sheets could also trigger an interest in attending the PPH or providing written comments to the CPUC. Finally, the Fact Sheet would reach the broadest number of customers if a link to it was included in a revised billing notice.

3.8. Industry Division Presentations

While the Fact Sheets were considered a valuable addition to the pilot PPH program, the industry Divisions' presentations were not as well-received. The Divisions themselves expressed serious concerns about the severe staffing impact on staff analysts traveling to each PPH, when these Divisions' primary duty is to provide technical expertise to decisionmakers, in particular to the assigned ALJ.

The initial pilot PPH program announcement envisioned a five to 10-minute presentation by a member of the industry Division, giving a straightforward factual summary of the utility's application and the impact of the request on customers. Specifically stated in the announcement was that there would be no question and answer session.

The first two PPHs primarily reviewed the Fact Sheet that had been distributed, while later PPHs provided additional information on the utility's system and past GRCs. The presentations for SoCalGas, SDG&E, SJWC, and Liberty Utilities were generally about 10-15 minutes. However, the PG&E presentations, which had a summary of two cases, were considerably longer, and sometimes public comment did not begin until an hour after the start of the PPH.

Concerns raised about the industry presentations were that, similar to the Fact Sheets, they were too technical, and, for PG&E, they were too long. Another concern was that the industry Divisions' role is to advise the CPUC and the public may misunderstand the presentation. For example, the public may perceive that (1) the presenter has already decided to accept the utility's recommendations, or (2) the industry Division presenter is the utility, or (3) assertions made by the utility in its application are reported as facts (e.g., stating that certain infrastructure is old and therefore needs to be upgraded). Commenters said that to avoid the above problems, there should be dedicated staff with both strong technical as well as communication skills.

Finally, the Divisions believe that having industry Division staff prepare and rehearse presentations, and then travel throughout the state for multiple PPHs put a tremendous strain on industry Division resources, one that cannot be maintained going forward under current staff levels. Energy Division's suggestion is that the CPUC have a designated Public Information Officer (PIO) who can conduct the presentation rather than industry Division staff. Energy

Division believes a PIO who is trained in providing complex information to the public in an easy to understand format, and who is comfortable with public speaking and with handling questions from the public, would be more effective in meeting the CPUC's goal of better informing the public.

Commissioners and staff recommended that the industry Divisions' presentations use a PowerPoint format in order to better engage the audience. At the Park and AVR PPHs, ALJ and Water Divisions, as well as the utilities, confirmed the venues had audio/visual (A/V) capabilities and technical support staff available to do this, following which the Water Division prepared a short PowerPoint presentation. For Park, the A/V worked for the afternoon PPH, but the technician could not make it work for the evening PPH. For both AVR PPHs, the technician could not properly adjust the focus for the venue's four screens. Therefore, the CPUC needs back-up options planned if further A/V presentations are done.

The industry divisions and Public Advocates Office are also concerned about the cost of sending staff to GRC PPHs, especially in light of the sparse attendance. As discussed above, the best presentations were quite short, and there were few members of the public present. Even using a Public Information Officer, the CPUC should carefully weigh which PPHs it would be best to schedule a presentation. It may be more effective in meeting the CPUC's goal of better informing the public to have presentations made to larger community groups than at the PPH.

The shorter presentations done by the applicant and Public Advocates Office at the beginning of the PPH were well received and, especially if Information Sessions are not held, should be continued; other interested formal parties could also be encouraged at the PHC and in the ALJ Ruling scheduling the PPHs to make brief presentations. These presentations, combined with

revised Fact Sheets prepared by the Industry Divisions, meet the CPUC's goal of better informing the public about the proceeding.

We recommend discontinuing the in-person industry Division presentations as part of GRC PPHs as these presentations were too technical, raised questions about the role of these Divisions, and placed staffing burdens on the industry Divisions. One alternative would be shorter online presentations that could be played at the start of a PPH if the right AV equipment is available. The utility presentation at the beginning of the PPH should provide the public additional information about the utility's request (and other parties could briefly state their positions) and, therefore, should continue.

4. Initiatives to Improve Online Access to Enable the Public to More Fully Participate in the CPUC's Decision-making

While increasing public attendance at our PPHs is important, we should not lose sight of the fact that most customers will not spend the time and effort to attend a hearing. Of PG&E's 4 million residential customers, only 142 people showed up for 14 hearings held in seven cities.

Customers can mail or email written comments to the CPUC at any time in the proceeding. Recognizing that the CPUC can more effectively serve customers through providing better online access, the NOO, with input from ALJ Division and Legal Division, has been working with Information Technology (IT) to develop a proceeding-specific online public comment form. When completed, the public will be able to use the Commission's online Docket Card to comment on specific proceedings. Public comment will be visible to the commenter and other members of the public. In addition, the public comment feature will make

it much easier for Commissioners, ALJs, and others to view public comment in an efficient and timely manner.⁵

This project is important in improving transparency and public access to the CPUC's processes. We note that most customers have computers and smart phones that provide them Internet access. In addition, through the California Teleconnect Fund, we provide discounts for Internet access to community libraries where the public can enjoy free wi-fi connection and computer terminals. Through the California Advanced Services Fund (CASF), the CPUC administers grants and loans to bring broadband infrastructure to underserved communities throughout California.

Other website upgrades such as placing testimony and exhibits on the Docket Card will provide the public better access to CPUC proceedings. Transcripts will be available electronically through their links on the Docket Card on a going forward basis starting this quarter. Testimony and exhibits are currently available online (but not on the Docket Card) using the Find Document feature and searching for "supporting documents." Certain parties, including the utilities and Public Advocates Office, also make their exhibits available on their own websites. Links to these websites are included in the Fact Sheets. In the future, the online transcripts will be able to include advanced search features. This will allow the public to easily access and review PPH and evidentiary hearing transcripts.

The website upgrades discussed in this section will provide customers better access to information on specific proceedings and allow them to participate more effectively; these projects are responsive to the directives of SB 512 to increase public participation and to make the CPUC's processes more

⁵ It could also allow ALJ Division to run reports on comments, such as (1) comments for all proceedings by zip code, and (2) comments for a proceeding for a specific date range

transparent. As the new web-based systems become operational in the next months, the customers' hearing notices could reference these systems as part of the planned roll out.

5. Beyond PPHs

Improving opportunities for meaningful public participation, engagement and education in our proceedings and in policy implementation is important both to the public and to our decision-making process. As discussed above, PPHs have a specific and necessary role in formal proceedings, however a formal PPH may not always be the best forum for engaging with, educating, and increasing public participation. Rather than altering the structure of PPHs to accomplish these goals, there are other vehicles for increased public engagement that should be considered.

One option is workshops. These forums are typically run by industry Division staff. They usually include presenters with subject matter expertise or representing different community perspectives. Workshops also include public comments and questions. Workshops are generally structured with an agenda but do not have the formality of a PPH and can therefore seem less intimidating to the public. Additionally, there can often be an opportunity for panel responses to public comments. On December 14, 2018, for example, the CPUC held a *Workshop on Impacts from De-Energization: Focus on Vulnerable Populations* in Santa Rosa. More than 100 people attended in-person and more than 70 people joined on the phone. Participants included first responders, disability advocates and interested public.

Another option are community meetings. These meetings can be structured however the organizing Commissioner office or Division chooses, such as a roundtable or small discussion groups. Commissioner Guzman Aceves held multiple community meetings throughout the San Joaquin Valley and other

areas on several issues, including R.15-03-010, *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Identify Disadvantaged Communities in the San Joaquin Valley and Analyze Economically Feasible Options to Increase Access to Affordable Energy in those Disadvantaged Communities*. The meetings were well attended, varying from 29 attendees in Seville to 112 in California City.

We recommend that Commissioner offices and industry Divisions, in consultation with the assigned ALJ, utilize these alternative forms of public engagement and other ad hoc forums to increase public education and engagement, depending on the goal of the event. These forums offer increased flexibility of structure and noticing, as well as the increased opportunity for discussion and dialogue. If the meeting is related to a proceeding, the office or Division leading the forum can prepare a report that may be incorporated into the record. NOO will coordinate with Commissioner offices, ALJs, and industry Divisions to help them determine what type of forum best suits their needs.

Additionally, NOO, in coordination with ALJ Division and IT, has been expanding remote access to better inform the public about policies and proceedings and allow increased participation outside of PPHs. These efforts include detailed webpages for many proceedings and hot topics, increased telephonic and video/streaming remote access, the upcoming online public comment form discussed above, and other mediums such as subscription services and online surveys.

Along with these efforts, the CPUC should consider hosting virtual PPHs or public forums. On August 14, 2018, NOO hosted a webinar on *Understanding and Interacting with the CPUC - A Practical Guide for Local Governments and CBOs*. The webinar had 80 participants and utilized considerably less resources than in-person events. In a follow-up survey, 52 percent of the respondents found the

webinar to be “Extremely” or “Very Helpful;” 39 percent found it to be “Somewhat Helpful.”

We recommend that the Division leading any public forum, whether in-person or virtual, employ surveys or similar attendee evaluation methods to continuously improve outreach and engagement efforts.

6. Conclusion

The CPUC devoted considerable staff resources and attention to the pilot PPH program in order to better educate the public about the energy and water GRC proceedings and to increase meaningful public participation that the CPUC can use in its decision-making, as well as gather information about the effectiveness of the PPH process. While low attendance at the energy GRC PPHs is an overriding issue that the pilot program was not able to improve, in other areas there were positive benefits from the program.

For example, the industry Divisions' Fact Sheets developed for the pilot are a tool that can and should be refined and used in additional ways to better inform the public about the proceedings. In addition, the Pilot PPH Program highlighted useful ideas for improving customer bill insert notices, ways the utilities can assist to distribute hearing notices in their service territories, and recommendations for working with community leaders and CBOs to select PPH venues that will be more accessible for the public.

In addition, the online Docket Card projects for proceeding specific comments and online transcripts and testimony were being developed concurrently with the pilot program and will also support enhanced public participation.

It is recommended that the CPUC apply the recommendations of this report to new energy and water GRC PPHs. For water GRCs, California Water Service and Great Oaks Water Company filed their GRCs on July 2, 2018, and in

2019 San Gabriel Valley Water Company is scheduled to file on January 1, 2019, and California American Water Company on July 1, 2019. For energy GRCs, PG&E is scheduled to file on January 1, 2019, and SCE on September 1, 2019.

Finally, while this report addresses energy and water GRC PPHs, the lessons learned can also be applied to other proceedings that the assigned Commissioner and ALJ determines would benefit from PPHs.

Recommendations

1. The Kick Off Meeting should include NOO, the assigned ALJ, the assigned Commissioner office and industry division analyst. The Kick Off Meeting should be held within 2 weeks of proceeding assignment so that the right outreach alternatives can be identified, the parties can comment on the proposed outreach at the PHC, and PPHs can be scheduled with enough time for customer notice.
2. NOO should create a toolkit documenting alternative types of public meetings and discuss the alternatives at the Kick Off Meeting. Tools should be selected keeping in mind the needs of the specific case.
3. ALJ Division and NOO should set up an internal CPUC working group to assess the value of PPH input in different types of proceedings and make recommendations for future.
4. The format of the customer bill inserts for rate cases should be reviewed and re-designed to improve customer awareness of PPHs. For electronic billing customers, the notice should automatically appear when electronic bill is viewed. NOO, in consultation with ALJ Division, will take the lead in assessing bill inserts for GRCs and determining what improvements should be made
5. In scheduling PPHs, the assigned Commissioner and ALJ should give strong consideration to holding the PPH toward the beginning of the proceeding in order to inform the community early about the proceeding and how they can participate in it. This also will allow the CPUC and parties to more easily incorporate the issues of interest to the public into the evidentiary hearing schedule.
6. The assigned Commissioner and ALJ should closely coordinate early in the proceeding with NOO and its outreach team in order to engage community leaders and community-based organizations (CBOs) in selecting the dates, times, and venues to consider for PPHs. NOO will continue to consider libraries, community or senior centers, areas close to residential areas, and venues with good parking, lack of physical barriers, and nearby public transit.
7. An ALJ Ruling scheduling the PPHs should be issued that provides, pursuant to Rule 13.1(c), for additional notice provisions. These provisions should include that, when feasible, the customer bill insert be mailed by the utility to its customers in their monthly bills

at least 10-15 days before the first scheduled PPH and that the utility provide NOO and the assigned ALJ, not later than five days prior to the first PPH, a letter verifying that the utility has complied with the customer notice requirement and stating the date(s) notice was sent to customers and the approximate number of customers so notified. The assigned Commissioner and ALJ in consultation with NOO should also consider having the utility take additional steps not listed in Rule 13.1(b), such as issuing a media advisory and conducting social media and directing the utility to perform outreach similar to that described in Section 3.5 describing SCE's efforts.

8. The CPUC should continue the use of the Fact Sheets developed by Water and Energy Divisions for the pilot PPH program, with revisions by NOO to make language and format more user-friendly. These Fact Sheets should be broadly disseminated in the PPH communities prior to the hearing and posted to the CPUC's website and used on the CPUC's social media.
9. At the start of each PPH, there should be a short presentation explaining the case and the timeline. This can be done by the applicant, and formal parties can also make brief presentations, if desired. This, together with the Industry Division's prepared Fact Sheet, will provide the public information about the utility's request and other parties' positions.
10. At each PPH, NOO will provide interested attendees with information on how to sign up to receive Proposed and Final decisions through the CPUC's subscription service.
11. When the Docket Card online systems for proceeding specific comments, transcripts, and testimony become operational in the next months, the CPUC should reference or include information on these in hearing notices and at the PPHs. In outreach materials and at PPHs, promote new and existing tools such as Subscription Service, Online Comment Portal, links to Docket Card, Twitter feed, as available.
12. Because PPHs have a specific procedural purpose, the CPUC should consider utilizing other public forums, such as workshops and community meetings, for certain educational or outreach purposes. Virtual meetings should also be utilized. NOO should work with

assigned Commissioner and ALJ to determine which proceedings would lend themselves to each format.

13. The CPUC should continue to offer remote access to PPHs and other public forums. NOO will lead a cross-Divisional team to assess needs and capabilities for remote access.
14. A short video summarizing an application could be prepared by the industry division under the direction of the NOO and in consultation with the assigned ALJ could be posted on the web and/or played at the start of a PPH or community meeting.
15. The Division leading any public forum, whether in-person or virtual, should use surveys or similar attendee evaluation methods to continuously improve outreach and engagement efforts. NOO will continue to provide surveys at all PPHs

Public Participation Hearing Pilot Report

List of Appendices

Appendix A - Commission Employees Participating in the PPH Pilot

Appendix B – List of PPH Location, Date, Attendees and Speakers

Appendix C – Summary of Internal CPUC Questionnaire Responses

Appendix D – Summary of Customer Questionnaire Responses

Appendix E – Example of a Bill Insert Notice

Appendix F – Example of PPH Pilot Fact Sheet

Appendix G – Example of Simplified Fact Sheet

Public Participation Hearing Pilot Report

Appendix A

Commission Employees Participating in the Pilot Public Participation Hearings (PPHs) April - October 2018

Executive Offices

Commissioner Martha Guzman Aceves
Commissioner Carla J. Peterman
Commissioner Liane M. Randolph
Commissioner Clifford Rechtschaffen
Advisors:
Joanna Gubman
Jennifer Kalafut
Shannon O'Rourke
Yuliya Schmidt
Sean Simon

News and Outreach Office

Terrie Prosper, Director
Allison Brown, Public Advisor
Stephanie Green, Supervisor
Juanita Hill, Supervisor
Love Asiedu-Akrofi
Hope Christman
Steven Klaiber
Chris Moore
Sadrud-Din Muhammad
Cindy Nelson
Claudia Sanchez
Emilio Victorio-Sanchez
Agatha Wein

Administrative Law Judge Division

ALJ Adeniyi Ayoade
ALJ Karl Bemesderfer
ALJ Dan Burcham
ACALJ Anthony Colbert
ALJ Gerald Kelly
ALJ Rafael Lirag
ACALJ Jeanne McKinney
Gaby Perez (Calendar Clerk)
ALJ Steven Roscow
ALJ Christine Walwyn

Energy Division

Eugene Cadenasso
Franz Cheng
Dorothy Duda
Kevin Flaherty
Belinda Gatti
Laura Krannawitter
Christine Ly
Laura Martin
Carlos Velasquez
Christopher Westling

Water Division

Bruce DeBerry
James Boothe
Tayeb Mogri
Carmen Rocha

Public Advocates Office

Truman Burns
Victor Chan
Darwin Farrar
Christian Lambert
Pui-Wa Li
Nusrat Molla
Anusha Nagesh
Eileen Odell
Dao Phan
Mark Pocta
Richard Rauschmeier
Tom Roberts
Nat Skinner
Linda Serizawa
Mark Waterworth

Appendix B
PPH Information Sessions Pilot Program

| Date | Proceeding # | Event Type/Name | Assigned Commissioner/ ALJ(s) | Location | Attendees | Public Speakers | Notes |
|----------|--------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5/29/18 | A.17-10-008 | SoCalGas GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Visalia | 2pm: 3 7pm: 1 Total: 4 | 2pm: 1 7pm: 1 Total: 2 | No- Info session |
| 5/30/18 | A.18-01-004 | San Jose Water Company | Peterman/Bemesderfer | San Jose | Total: 110 | Total: 36 | Info session- No tables |
| 6/12/18 | A.17-10-008 | SoCalGas GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Palmdale | 2pm: 13 7pm: 10 Total: 23 | 2pm: 4 7pm: 2 Total: 8 | No- Info session |
| 6/13/18 | A.17-10-007 | SDGE GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | El Cajon | 2pm: 14 7pm: 11 Total: 25 | 2pm: 3 7pm: 5 Total: 8 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/14/18 | A.17-10-008 | SoCalGas GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Oxnard | 2pm: 14 7pm: 9 Total: 23 | 2pm: 8 7pm: 2 Total: 10 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/19/18 | A.17-10-008 | SoCalGas GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Inglewood | 2pm: 11 7pm: 8 Total: 19 | 2pm: 7 7pm: 2 Total: 9 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/20/18 | A.17-10-009 | SoCalGas GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Long Beach | 2pm: 13 7pm: 5 Total: 18 | 2pm: 8 7pm: 2 Total: 10 | No- Info session |
| 6/21/18 | A.17-10-008 | SoCalGas GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Riverside | 2pm: 7pm: 21 Total: 21 | 2pm: 5 7pm: 11 Total: 16 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/26/18 | A.17-10-007 | SDGE GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Escondido | 2pm: 19 7pm: 7 Total: 26 | 2pm: 3 7pm: 1 Total: 4 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/26/18 | A.17-09-006 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | Sacramento | 2pm: 23 7pm: 15 Total: 38 | 2pm: 0 7pm: 1 Total: 1 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/27/18 | A.17-09-006 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | Fresno | 2pm: 22 7pm: 23 Total: 45 | 2pm: 4 7pm: 2 Total: 6 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/28/18 | A.17-09-006 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | Bakersfield | 2pm: 20 7pm: 2 Total: 22 | 2pm: 3 7pm: 0 Total: 3 | Yes- Info session |
| 6/28/18 | A.17-10-007 | SDGE GRC PPH | Randolph/Lirag | Chula Vista | 2pm: 19 7pm: 34 Total: 53 | 2pm: 6 7pm: 22 Total: 28 | Yes- Info session |
| 7/10/18 | A.17-09-006 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | Chico | 2pm: 2 7pm: 0 Total: 2 | 2pm: 0 7pm: 0 Total: 0 | Yes- Info session |
| 7/11/18 | A.17-09-006 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | San Francisco | 2pm: 2 7pm: 4 Total: 6 | 2pm: 1 7pm: 0 Total: 1 | Yes- Info session |
| 7/16/18 | A.17-09-006 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | San Jose | 2pm: 2 7pm: 0 Total: 2 | 2pm: 2 7pm: 0 Total: 2 | Yes- Info session |
| 7/17/18 | A.17-09-007 | PG&E GT&S PPH | Rechtschaffen/Ayoade/Roscow | Oakland | 2pm: 14 7pm: 23 Total: 37 | 2pm: 11 7pm: 14 Total: 25 | No- Info session. Space unavailable |
| 10/18/18 | A.18-01-003 | Park Water GRC | Peterman/Burcham | Bellflower | 1pm: 22 6pm: 29 Total: 51 | 2pm: 9 7pm: 10 Total: 19 | No- Info session |
| 10/25/18 | A.18-01-002 | Apple Valley GRC | Peterman/Burcham | Apple Valley | 1pm: 53 6pm: 55 Total: 108 | 2pm: 11 7pm: 14 Total: 25 | No- Info session |

Appendix C
CPUC Participating Staff and Interested Parties' Responses to PPH Pilot Questionnaire

| Comments below include tally of topics with 7 or more reponses | Commissioner Offices | ALJ Division | Public Advisor Office | Energy Division | Water Division | Cal Advocates | TURN | SDG&E | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|------|-------|-------|
| Total Number of Questionnaires Returned by Division | 1 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 35 |
| Increase media outreach and update PAO brochures. | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | 7 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| Retain Industry Division Fact Sheets; Use less technical language. | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| Early in the proceeding, work closely with Community Based Organizations (CBO's) and local governments on PPH outreach and choice of PPH locations and dates/times. | 1 | 2 | 7 | | | 4 | 1 | | 15 |
| Retain/Modify Information Sessions | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | | 4 | 1 | | 16 |
| Use more technology; power point slides, videos, webinars. | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | 10 |
| Redesign CPUC website to allow the public more accessiblity/transparency for information on specific proceedings, and to post on-line written comments. | 1 | 1 | | | | 5 | 1 | | 8 |
| Have short PPH presentations by utility and other parties. | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | 8 |
| Redesign customer bill insert notices, including electronic bill notices. | | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | 1 | | 7 |
| Include representatives for other services (i.e. CPUC low-income programs, CAB complaints, utility billing representatives) at PPH locations. | | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | | 7 |
| Industry Divisions should not make presentations. | | 1 | | 4 | | 2 | | | 7 |

Appendix D
Eight PPH Pilot Survey Responses

| Rank | Question | Newspaper/Radio/ TV | CBO | Friend | Facebook | Bill Insert |
|------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----|--------|----------|-------------|
| 1 | How Did you hear about the PPH? | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | Question | Yes | NO |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 2 | Do you have capability to make online comments or to joint a webinair? | 7 | 1 |
| 3 | Would you prefer to provide onlilne comments on the CPUC's website rather than attend a PPH? | 6 | 2 |
| 4 | Would you prefer if PPHs were expanded and held in conjunction with meetings where the utilities and other parties to the proceeding explain and discuss their positions? | 7 | 0 |
| 5 | Would you prefer to make online comments on the CPUC's Facebook or Twitter pages rather than attend a PPH? | 2 | 4 |
| 6 | Would you prefer toto make verbal or written comments via a webinar (a meeting conducted over the internet)? | 2 | 3 |

APPENDIX E

The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) is reviewing this application. ORA is the independent consumer advocate within the CPUC with a legislative mandate to represent investor-owned utility customers to obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. ORA has a multi-disciplinary staff with expertise in economics, finance, accounting and engineering. For more information about ORA, please call (415) 703-1584, email ora@cpuc.ca.gov or visit ORA's website at <http://ora.ca.gov/default.aspx>.

STAY INFORMED

The CPUC offers a free Subscription Service which is available on the CPUC website at www.cpuc.ca.gov, which allows you to follow this proceeding. If you would like to learn how you can participate in the proceeding, or if you would like to submit written comments, or if you have questions about the CPUC process, you can contact the CPUC's Public Advisor's Office at the address noted below. When writing, please reference proceeding SDG&E GRC No. A.17-10-007. All written correspondence and emails are provided to the Commissioners and the assigned Administrative Law Judge for this proceeding to review.

Write: CPUC Public Advisor's Office
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

Phone: 1-866-849-8390



Para más detalles llame al 1-800-311-7343
NOTICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HEARINGS
REGARDING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
REQUEST TO INCREASE RATES FOR
THE 2019 GENERAL RATE CASE
APPLICATION NO. A.17-10-007

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) would like to hear your comments about San Diego Gas & Electric Company's (SDG&E®) request to increase your rates for the 2019-2022 General Rate Case (GRC). To do so, the CPUC invites you to attend a CPUC Public Participation Hearing (PPH) where you may comment or simply listen to what others in your community are saying. A CPUC Administrative Law Judge (Judge) will preside over the hearing. The CPUC's Commissioners may also attend. The CPUC has also asked SDG&E to provide customer service staff outside the hearing room for you to ask them questions about your bills. There may also be an Information Session an hour prior to the PPH at which SDG&E and other groups participating in the GRC proceeding (these groups are called "parties" to the proceeding) host tables to provide you with information on the proceeding. See www.cpuc.ca.gov/pph to find out if the PPH you are interested in attending will have an Information Session.

Hearing locations are wheelchair accessible. If you need other arrangements, such as language interpretation, please contact the CPUC Public Advisor's Office at least five days before the hearing you are attending. The Public Advisor's Office contact information is noted below. The dates, times, and locations of the PPHs follow:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| June 13, 2018 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. | <u>EL CAJON</u> El Cajon City Hall City Council Chambers 200 Civic Center Way El Cajon, CA 92020 |
| June 26, 2018 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. | <u>ESCONDIDO</u> California Center for the Arts Salon 3 340 N. Escondido Blvd. Escondido, CA 92025 |

June 28, 2018

2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

CHULA VISTA

Chula Vista City Hall

Council Chambers

276 Fourth Ave.

Chula Vista, CA 91910

SDG&E'S RATE INCREASE REQUEST

On October 6, 2017, SDG&E filed an application with the CPUC requesting to increase revenues for its 2019-2022 GRC¹. SDG&E requested to increase revenue by \$218 million, to \$2.199 billion in 2019. Based on all the information presented in this proceeding, the CPUC will determine the rates that SDG&E will collect from its consumers to cover its operating and maintenance costs for 2019. As part of this proceeding, the CPUC will also decide whether to approve SDG&E's proposal to increase rates an additional 7.2 percent in 2020, 5.2 percent in 2021, and an additional 5 percent in 2022².

Every three years, SDG&E is required to file a GRC with the CPUC³. GRCs determine the total amount of money a utility is allowed to collect through rates in a given year. How the increase is assigned to customer groups will be determined in separate proceedings. This particular application does not include the cost to purchase natural gas and electricity for SDG&E customers. Those costs are evaluated and authorized in a separate proceeding.

SDG&E's primary reasons for asking for the rate increases are:

- To invest in its gas and electric systems to enhance safety and reliability, and to manage risks that could impact their employees, customers, and/or system;
- To invest in the needs of its approximately 3.5 million customers by, among other things, empowering customers with information and tools to better manage their gas and electricity use;

1. The application was revised by SDG&E on December 20, 2017, and again on April 6, 2018 to incorporate the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA).
2. 2020-2022 increases were also adjusted in the April 6, 2018 testimony submission.
3. SDG&E is proposing a return to the four-year cycle in this application due to administrative cost.

- To invest in its gas and electricity systems and technologies that advance clean energy for customers and the environment;
- To fund support services and employee training to keep SDG&E operating and to provide SDG&E's customers with safe, reliable and responsive customer service; and
- To meet regulatory and compliance requirements driven by system safety and reliability and environmental compliance.

OBTAINING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For more information about SDG&E's GRC application filing, you may write to Charles Manzuk, Regulatory Affairs Department, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, 8330 Century Park Ct., San Diego, CA 92123-1447. You may also view a copy of the application on SDG&E's website:

<https://www.sdge.com/regulatory-filing/22261/sdge-2019-general-rate-case>

Copies of this insert will be available for viewing and printing on the SDG&E website:

<https://www.sdge.com/regulatory-notice>.

The application may also be reviewed in person at the CPUC's Central Files Office by appointment. For more information, contact aljcentralfilesid@cpuc.ca.gov or 1-415-703-2045.

CPUC PROCESS

This application has been assigned to an Administrative Law Judge who will determine how to receive evidence and other related documents necessary for the CPUC to establish a record upon which to base its decision. Evidentiary Hearings (EHs) may be held where parties will present their testimony and may be subject to cross-examination by other parties. These EHs are open to the public, but only those who are parties can participate. After considering all proposals and all evidence presented during the formal hearing process, the Administrative Law Judge assigned to this proceeding will issue a proposed decision that may adopt SDG&E's proposal, modify it, or deny it. Any CPUC Commissioner may propose an alternate decision. The proposed decision, and any alternate decision, will be discussed and voted upon at a scheduled public CPUC Voting Meeting.

APPENDIX F



FACT SHEET

Liberty Utilities (Park Water Corp.-A.18-01-003) General Rate Case

July 2019

Requested Utility Revenue Increases:

Total increase, \$4.82 million over the three-year rate case cycle, results in a \$18.48 monthly increase to the average customer bill by the year 2021

- 2019: \$1.11 million (or 3.21%) increase
- 2020: \$1.77 million (or 4.98%) increase
- 2021: \$1.94 million (or 5.24%) increase

A typical Liberty Park Water residential customer with a 5/8" meter using 17.62 Ccf (one Ccf = 748 gallons) every two months would see a bi-monthly bill increase from \$147.80 at present rates to \$152.94 (3.48%) in 2019; to \$160.16 (4.72%) in 2020; and to \$ 166.28 (3.82%) in 2021.

The bill impact does not include temporary existing or proposed credits and surcharges.

Factors Cited by Liberty Utilities for Requested Rate Increase:

• Capital improvements requested by Liberty Utilities:

- \$4,446,600 for storage tank and pump station for 2019,
- 1,200,000 for new well, for year 2019,
- \$1,248,900 Advance Meter Infrastructure (AMI) and small meter replacement for 2019,
- \$1,244,200 for AMI for year 2019,
- \$1,292,700 for AMI for year 2020,
- \$1,000,000 for water rights for year 2020, and
- \$4,180,600 Water Main Replacements for year 2021

Cost Components of Utility Requested Revenue: \$35.7 Million



- Water Supply Costs include: Purchased Water, Pump Taxes, Purchased Power, Chemicals, Other.
- Capital Carrying Costs include: Depreciation, Income Taxes, Property Taxes, Return on Rate Base.
- Operation & Maintenance, Administrative & General Costs include: Payroll, Pension & Benefits, Materials, Services.



Liberty Utilities (Park Water) Corp. Residential Monthly Bill Impacts Based on Requested Revenue Increases:

| Customer Charge by Meter Size | Rates as of Dec. 31, 2018 | 2019 Rates \$ (% increase) | 2020 Rates \$ (% increase) | 2021 Rates \$ (% increase) |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 5/8 inch | \$23.20 | \$(2.09) (-9.01%) | \$0.99 (4.69%) | \$0.86 (3.89%) |
| 3/4-inch | \$34.80 | \$(3.13) (-8.99%) | \$1.48 (4.67%) | \$1.29 (3.89%) |
| 1-inch | \$58.00 | \$(5.22) (-9.00%) | \$2.47 (4.68%) | \$2.15 (3.89%) |
| 1 1/2-inch | \$116.00 | \$(10.45) (-9.01%) | \$4.95 (4.69%) | \$4.30 (3.89%) |
| 2-inch | \$185.60 | \$(16.72) (-9.01%) | \$7.92 (4.69%) | \$6.88 (3.89%) |

| Water Usage Rate | Rates as of Dec. 31, 2017 | 2019 Rates \$ (% change) | 2020 Rates \$ (% increase) | 2021 Rates \$ (% increase) |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0 to 16 Ccf | \$5.756 | \$6.200 (7.71%) | \$6.493 (4.73%) | \$6.740 (3.80%) |
| Over 16 Ccf | \$5.268 | \$7.130 (7.72%) | \$7.467 (4.73%) | \$7.751 (3.80%) |

Rate Design Changes:

- The bi-monthly breakpoint for Tiered rates will be reduced from 9 Ccf to 8 Ccf.

Further Information on Proceeding:

- To review the application and request a copy of Applicant's General Rate Case testimony and exhibits, go to:

www.libertyutilities.com

- To review Public Advocates Office' testimony, go to:

<http://www.publicadvocates.cpuc.ca.gov/>

APPENDIX G



California Water Service Company (CWS) General Rate Case – A.18-07-001 Willows District

What is CWS Requesting in A.18-07-001?

Increases in Utility Revenue – Company Wide:

- 2020: \$50.7 million (7.6%) above authorized 2019 revenues
- 2021: \$31.5 million (4.4%) above proposed 2020 revenues
- 2022: \$33.0 million (4.4%) above proposed 2021 revenues

Increases in Utility Revenue – Willows District:

- 2020: \$0.81 million (33.2%) above authorized 2019 revenues
- 2021: \$0.26 million (7.9%) above proposed 2020 revenues
- 2022: \$0.27 million (7.7%) above proposed 2021 revenues

What Are the Main Reasons for the Requested Increase in Revenues?

Operation Expense Increases

- **Operation of New Treatment Plant**
 - \$0.39 million (47% of revenue increase in 2020)
- **IT Infrastructure Updates**
 - \$0.08 million (9% of revenue increase in 2020)

Infrastructure Investments

- **Main Replacement**
 - 5,000 feet of pipeline
 - \$2.2 million (10% of revenue increase in 2020)



How will CWS's Request Impact Me?

Bill Impacts

(Not Including CPUC fee and City Tax)

| Service Charge (Meter Size) | Current 2019 | Proposed 2020 | Proposed 2021 | Proposed 2022 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5/8" | \$38.55 | \$34.35 | \$36.97 | \$39.70 |
| 3/4" | \$52.73 | \$51.53 | \$55.46 | \$59.55 |
| 1" | \$78.95 | \$85.88 | \$92.43 | \$99.25 |
| Quantity Rate | | | | |
| Tier 1 | 1 - 8 CCF \$2.1460 | 1 - 9 CCF \$2.8287 | 1 - 9 CCF \$3.0455 | 1 - 9 CCF \$3.2718 |
| Tier 2 | 9 - 25 CCF \$2.3053 | 10 - 19 CCF \$3.5995 | 10 - 19 CCF \$3.8751 | 10 - 19 CCF \$4.1626 |
| Tier 3 | Over 25 CCF \$2.4859 | Over 19 CCF \$5.5266 | Over 19 CCF \$5.9492 | Over 19 CCF \$6.3899 |

An average residential customer with a 5/8-inch meter using 12 CCF (1 CCF = 748 gallons) would see an increase in each bill from \$64.94 currently to **\$70.61** per month in 2020 under CWS's request in A.18-07-001. The same bill would be **\$76.01** in 2021 and **\$81.64** in 2022 resulting an overall 25.7% rate increase over 3 years.

Where Can I Go for Further Information on the Proceeding?

- To review CWS's Application, or to request a copy of all exhibits, including supporting testimony, please go to:
<https://www.calwater.com/rates/iip-2018/>
- To review Public Advocates Office's testimony, go to:
<http://www.publicadvocates.cpuc.ca.gov/cws.aspx>
- Please submit comments to the Public Advisors Office to the following email (public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov). Please be sure to include the proceeding number A.18-07-001 in the email subject.